

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/604,705	MAREN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Khanh B. Pham	2166	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Khanh B. Pham, Examiner.

(3) Dr. Alianna Maren, Inventor.

(2) Jeannine Bartlet.

(4) Trevor Coddington, Applicant's Representative.

(5) Chirs Paulin.

Date of Interview: 15 August 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 39 and 51.

Identification of prior art discussed: Zimmerman (US 6,678,694).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants explained the inventive concept of the invention and pointed out the different between Zimmerman's sytem and the instant invention as recited in the amended claims filed 6/7/2007. The examiner agreed that Zimmerman does not teach the step of computing a utility function measure a utility of said second subset and adjusting the parameter value based on said utility function as claimed. The examiner also proposed amendment to clarify the claims and to correct minor informality .